

-5-

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 were rejected in an Office Action dated November 29, 2005. The Title of the Invention, paragraph 1, and claim 1 have been amended; new claims 5 and 6 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the "Detailed Description of the Invention." Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Amendments to the Specification

The Title of the Invention has been amended. The title is descriptive of the claimed invention.

Paragraph 1, which recites the priority claim of the instant application, has been amended to clarify the information stated therein. Where the purpose of the amendment is for clarity and no new claim for priority is deemed added, Applicants' undersigned representative does not believe a petition for a benefit claim is required. However, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned representative if any further action on the part of Applicants is required.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 2,180,960, Kennedy, in view of USPN 5,649,860, Giuffrida. Applicants traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

First, the instant claimed invention is distinguishable from Kennedy where the claimed invention has a first, generally tubular insertable section that is insertable into the inflatable article through the wall of the inflatable article. The portion of the connector assembly that inserts is insertable from the outside of the article and passing through the wall of the article to insert into the inflatable article. This feature, among other things, allows for the connector to be optionally placed and removed after final article construction. This is clearly distinguishable from Kennedy where the shank 12 of the member 10, passes from within the receptacle, and through the wall of the receptacle, to the outside of the receptacle for engaging a hose. Specifically, at page 2, regarding assembly of the nipple structure with the liquid receptacle, the positioning of the parts is recited wherein it is stated that

-6-

the inner surface of the liquid receptacle engages the face 14 of the head 13, not the shank. Thus, Kennedy does not disclose or suggest an internal insertable section that is "insertable into the inflatable article through an opening in a flexible wall of said inflatable article" as claimed by Applicants.

New claims 5 and 6 are clearly distinguishable from Kennedy where the washer of Kennedy is secured onto a shank which is external to the liquid receptacle, and where the washer is secured on an external receptacle wall. As stated above, regarding the assembly of the parts of the nipple structure and liquid receptacle of Kennedy, the member 19 (washer) is positioned on the external portion of the nipple structure and adjacent the external wall of the liquid receptacle (see paragraph bridging page 1 and 2, lines 9-11 where it is stated that the face 21 of the member 19 is in abutting relation with the outer surface of the wall of the receptacle).

Moreover, there is no motivation to modify the liquid receptacle and nipple assembly of Kennedy with a method of delivering pressurized air through delivery outlets as taught by Giuffrida. Kennedy does not discuss pressure losses, energy consumption or flow regulation, which are the objects of the invention of Giuffrida (col. 1-2). There is no suggestion of how to modify the air conditioning system of Giuffrida in which pressurized air is delivered through ducts of a building, in a manner suitable to a liquid receptacle of Kennedy; therefore, also no reasonable expectation of success. Nor would it be clear to one skilled in the art from the disclosure of Kennedy, in view of Giuffrida, that such a modification would be desirable where a liquid receptacle would thus be subject to expulsion of liquids through 'delivery outlets' when the system is in use. In any event, this combination of references appears to be based solely on the impermissible use of hindsight reconstruction in view of the present invention. Removal of the rejection under §103 is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present invention as defined by claims 1-4, and new claims 5 and 6, is neither taught nor suggested by any of the references of record. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that these

-7-

claims are now in form for allowance. If further questions remain, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Applicants' undersigned representative before issuing a further Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Dianne Burkhard, 41,650
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: May 24, 2006